Exhibit 3

1 DATCTERC UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 1 2 2 3 In Re: Attacks on September 3 11, 2001 03 MDL 1570 (GBD) (FM) 4 4 5 5 New York, NY 6 October 29, 2013 6 10:23 a.m. 7 7 8 Before: 8 9 HON. FRANK MAAS, 9 Magistrate Judge 10 10 **APPEARANCES** 11 11 COZEN O'CONNOR 12 Attorneys for Federal Insurance Company Plaintiffs 12 BY: SEAN P. CARTER 13 J. SCOTT TARBUTTON 13 14 14 MOTLEY RICE Attorneys for Burnett Plaintiffs 15 BY: ROBERT T. HAEFELE 15 16 16 17 ANDERSON, KILL & OLICK Attorneys for Plaintiff O'Neill 17 BY: JERRY S. GOLDMAN 18 18 19 KREINDLER & KREINDLER 19 Attorneys for Ashton Plaintiffs BY: ANDREW J. MALONEY 20 20 21 MANNING SOSSAMON Attorneys for Sana-Bell, Inc. and Sanabel Al Kheer, Inc. 21 22 Defendants BY: CHRISTOPHER C.S. MANNING 22 23 24 25 SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

DATCTERC APPEARANCES CLIFFORD CHANCE Attorneys for Dubai Islamic Bank Defendant BY: RONI E. BERGOFFEN DOAR RIECK KALEY & MACK Attorneys for Yassin Abdullah Kadi Defendant BY: AMY ROTHSTEIN PETER C. SALERNO LEWIS BAACH Attorneys for MWL and IIRO Defendants BY: ERIC L. LEWIS BY: AISHA HENRY SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

DATCTERC

 (Case called)

THE COURT: Good morning everyone. Yesterday, later than I had planned, we filed a combined decision, and report, and recommendation concerning three of the motions, and no other counsel got notice of that at a time when they could still look at it. Plaintiffs' counsel seen it already.

MR. CARTER: Your Honor, we did see it late last night. I will confess I haven't had a chance to read it thoroughly. The one thing that we did note, as I think your Honor had indicated for the fee applications, a deadline had been set for 30 days.

THE COURT: If you want to extend that, and you work it out, I have no problem with that.

 $\,$ MR. CARTER: We will take stock of how much work is involved --

THE COURT: Obviously, if you wish to forego it, that's fine, too.

MR. CARTER: That seems unlikely, your Honor.

THE COURT: If you didn't read it, I spared you two pages, because it started out as a separate memorandum decision, and report and recommendation, but I combined the two when I entered the last two pages, which are a separate report and recommendation that were filed and deleted.

For those of you who haven't seen it, basically I concluded that an adverse inference was warranted and also an SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

DATCTERC

 award of attorneys' fees as to Rabita trust, recommended that a default judgment be entered as to Al Kheer, U.S.A. I concluded that sanctions were not warranted, but for reasons explained in the decision, the costs of the motion were recoverable. As to Al Khair, Saudi Arabia, I concluded a default judgment was appropriate. I know on the proposed agenda for this session, I had indicated that I thought the only thing that was right for consideration was the Sana-Bell motion.

Is there anything else we will need to take up?

MR. LEWIS: Your Honor, I just have a minor
housekeeping motion. We filed pro hac vice motions for three
of my colleagues, my partner, Ms. Henry and two other
attorneys in my firm; and they have been on file for some
months; and I just thought I would mention it.

THE COURT: They, obviously, got lost in the shuffle. The last decision I mentioned is document 2789, so there is a lot of forests. If you just give my law clerk the approximate date it was filed, we will see that it's taken care of.

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Turning to Sana-Bell, I guess the first question that I have as to the predecessor entity is if it doesn't exist at the moment, who retained you, Mr. Manning? Have you seen the decisions that have been filed?

MR. MANNING: I have not gone through it with the level of detail --

DATCTERC

THE COURT: Basically, as to Rabita trust, one of the things I concluded was that Mr. McMahon couldn't actually represent the trust, because he didn't appear to have a client whom he could communicate with. And it was not only a defunct organization, but one that didn't seem to have somebody who served in a capacity whereby they could retain counsel. That's why I'm inquiring about Sana-Bell.

MR. MANNING: Understood, your Honor. There is some question as to that issue in the case. I currently am retained by Sanabel Al Kheer, Inc. They assumed certain property, as I understand it, from Sana-Bell, Inc. There hasn't been a legal determination, I believe, as to the successor rights or obligations of that party, but at this point in order to ensure that all interests are, at least, represented to some extent, I have asserted myself as someone who represents that company.

THE COURT: I'm not sure you can do that. When you read the decision I just entered, you will see what my concern is.

My other major concern is I gained a middle initial that I never had in plaintiffs' papers, Frank B. Maas. I don't know where the "B" came from. It was just a minor point.

Let me hear from the plaintiffs with respect to the motion, and then I will get back to you.

MR. HAEFELE: Thank you, your Honor. First off, if I might address the question you just asked, your Honor, SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

6 DATCTERC regarding the existence or nonexistence --1 THE COURT: I thought you were going to address my 2 3 middle initial. MR. HAEFELE: No. I will leave you to decide that. 4 THE COURT: The jury is still out on that one. 5 MR. HAEFELE: I think that's for the Court to decide, 6 7 your Honor. As you may recall in the very early stages, if you 8 will, early stages at least with regard to Sanabel, there was a 9 decision by Judge Daniels that said there was insufficient data 10 in the record to determine that Sanabel did not exist. And 11 that's why his Honor entered an order that allowed -- denied 12 13 the motion to dismiss on behalf of Sanabel. So to the extent that that order is still in existence, and I believe it still 14 is, there remains no data in the records; they don't exist. 15 And I think we have been moving forward that they either don't 16 exist or if they do exist -- I'm sorry. Either they don't 17 exist and if they don't exist, Sanabel Al Kheer, the United 18 States entity, is the alter ego and the successor. I think 19 20 your Honor --THE COURT: If Sana-Bell doesn't exist and has no 21 assets, there probably isn't much there for you in any event, 22 23 correct? MR. HAEFELE: To the extent there are individuals that 24 25 have documents related to that entity --SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

7 DATCTERC THE COURT: That's a separate issue. 1 MR. HAEFELE: That is a separate issue, I agree. 2 THE COURT: I guess I'm looking at it in terms of the 3 big picture and your ability to recover damages from an entity, 4 if the entity, as a practical matter, no longer exists. I 5 think if Sanabel is a successor entity does -- and recognized 6 there may be some overlap between the two -- I'm not sure 7 what's gained by pursuing Sanabel. 8 9 MR. HAEFELE: I will address that in two stages, your 10 Honor. 11 THE COURT: Sure. MR. HAEFELE: First off, I haven't looked at this 12 issue in quite sometime, but my recollection is even where an 13 entity is wrapping up, under New York law, if they -- either if 14 they existed at the time the suit was filed or within a short 15 time period before that, there is still the opportunity to 16 reach back into the entity, if they haven't fully wrapped up by 17 18 the time the lawsuits --19 THE COURT: No question. Even a defunct entity can 20 continue to both prosecute and defend lawsuits. 21 MR. HAEFELE: Right. My recollection is that given the question marks that existed. The question marks 22 Sana-Bell's -- the first Sana-Bell's existence at the time of 23 the suit -- raised the issue that they clearly had not wrapped 24 up by the time the suit was started; and they may still not be 25

DATCTERC

wrapped up, I think is what the question is. But the other issue that I wanted to address -- and it goes to some other things in the motion today -- is that it's important to understand that this litigation was not brought just for financial recovery. It was also brought for the -- the 9/11 families, thousands and thousands of people that brought the suit, much of it has to do with wanting accountability and wanting to know what happened on 9/11; and part of that story is Sanabel, both the old Sana-Bell and the new Sanabel, and frankly, the Sanabel in Saudi Arabia, as well. So it's both the financial damages, as well as the accountability that they can get through the judicial system.

THE COURT: Fair enough.

MR. HAEFELE: Your Honor, I don't know that -- when we wrote the papers, I think, your Honor, we laid out quite a bit of the timeline facts of this. I resist boring you with that, unless your Honor has any questions about those. What I think we tried to do was lay both the standard -- the willfulness or bad faith on the part of the noncompliant party, the history of the noncompliance that dates all the way back to the time that we first filed.

THE COURT: I think you have to parse, at times -- and at other times I recognize, perhaps, it's fair to view this as a single entity, but the Sana-Bell record appears to suggest it dissolved. Whether it ceased to function is another question; SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

DATCTERC

at least it was formally dissolved before 9/11. I assume that's not a matter of dispute, Is it?

MR. HAEFELE: It is. Your Honor, I'm not sure it's still not -- I know that my colleague, Mr. Manning and his predecessor counsel, Mr. McMahon, have frequently and repeatedly argued what was decided by the Court, that Sana-Bell doesn't exist; the first Sana-Bell doesn't exist. But there still remains the same questions, that were in the record before Judge Daniels, haven't changed.

THE COURT: Well, Dr. Nirza was at least an officer of the successor entity, correct?

MR. HAEFELE: I believe he was an officer of both.

THE COURT: That was my next question. I know I
permitted you to depose him, and I know I narrowed the topic.

I'm not sure whether it was as to Sana-Bell, Sanabel Al Kheer,
or both as a practical matter. He is one of the people who
presumably knows what happened to Sana-Bell, correct?

Sana-Bell -- when I say "Sana-Bell" without a further verbiage,

I'm talking about the first entity.

MR. HAEFELE: He would be someone that would have, at least, familiarity with that, but I don't know -- I mean, I don't know that he knows the legal aspect of whether or not it completed the wrap-up. In other words, as far as I know, he wasn't the lawyer, or the person, that filled out the papers that concluded everything that was necessary to wrap up the SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

DATCTERC

 first Sana-Bell.

THE COURT: Well, there's two possibilities here as to the first Sana-Bell, one of which is it was dissolved before 9/11, presumably but not reasonably, they hadn't anticipated litigation at that point; and, therefore, probably sanctions are inappropriate.

The other is that it had some continuing existence, either by itself or in combination with Sanabel Al Kheer, in which then there could be discussion about sanctions. Don't I need to know which side of the line the first entity falls on before I can decide sanction motions?

Another way of asking that is: Is the motion premature?

MR. HAEFELE: Well, I think, your Honor, it's one of the two things. It is either that the two Sanabels are alter egos of one another, or the two Sanabels — or the second Sanabel is the successor and the first Sana-Bell does not exist. But in either instance, I think what's important is through all of this, whether it's one Sanabel or two Sanabels currently in existence, through the entire time that's significant here, the strings were being pulled in Saudi Arabia from the parent entity of the two Sanabels, which would be Sanabel Al Khair, the Saudi entity —

THE COURT: K-h-a-i-r?

MR. HAEFELE: Sanabel Al Khair.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

DATCTERC

 MR. HAEFELE: I know. And the parent, essentially, the effective parent of Sanabel Al Khair, Saudi Arabia would be IIRO and Muslim World League. So essentially, we still have one close-knit happy family that is running the show in Saudi Arabia for the Sanabel entities.

THE COURT: Well, in relation to the motion that's before me now, how do I know that strings are being pulled by the Saudi entity or its parents, IIRO/MWL?

MR. HAEFELE: What I would suggest, your Honor, is that if that becomes the string that holds things together for the opinion the Court is coming to, we would be happy to brief that issue. Much of the facts of that have been developed through or have gotten, both -- some of what we got from Sanabel, but also what we've received from IIRO and Muslim World League, what -- we are doing a rolling production from Sanabel -- or from IIRO, Muslim World League now.

In going through that, we are finding out more information about the relationship between Sanabel Al Kheer, Muslim World League and Sanabel Al Khair, Inc., Saudi Arabia, and the connection between them and the U.S. entities.

THE COURT: If the first Sana-Bell entity ceased to exist before 9/11, then I'm not sure you can make out a spoliation claim for its records, assuming that they were destroyed or handed off to somebody else before litigation was reasonably anticipated.

DATCTERC

One thing that concerns me is I'm not sure there is an adequate record as to that. I mean, Sanabel Al Kheer -- K-h-e-e-r -- the U.S. successor entity, the analysis may be much different, but as to the first entity, I'm not sure there is an adequate record to award sanctions at the present. Maybe ultimately. I'm just not sure you have gotten there yet.

MR. HAEFELE: I would have to think through that. I think I understand where you are coming from. Clearly, there was an obligation just under corporation law to turn over the documents to -- separate and apart from what their obligations -- to preserve evidence for the litigation, because obviously the litigation hadn't started, if they didn't exist pre-9/11/11.

THE COURT: Do you have records that related to the real estate transaction? I know there are records that show that Mr. McMahon did okay as a result of the real estate transaction, so there was some records.

MR. HAEFELE: Right. There are a few.

THE COURT: It doesn't sound like you have a whole closing binder.

MR. HAEFELE: That's correct. That closing happened in 2008, I believe. So clearly, it was long after the litigation started and deep into the obligation to exchange documents, let alone preserve documents.

THE COURT: And the seller was the first Sana-Bell SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

DATCTERC

entity selling property to the second?

MR. HAEFELE: No. I don't know who -- I don't recall who the purchaser was. But it was the -- the sale was -- again, it was orchestrated and there is evidence -- there is documentation within -- I think what we showed your Honor, but certainly within what we have -- that shows that there was permission to sell the property given in an exchange between IIRO and Sanabel, U.S.A. Interestingly, your Honor, the permission comes from Samir Al Rhadi. I don't know if you remember Samir Al Rhadi, but he was the gentleman, the supposed kindly volunteer that was helping IIRO and Muslim World League to go through the documents with Mr. McMahon, and we were supposed to have a telephone conference call with him, and he was a nice, older gentleman that was just sort of, quote, unquote, helping out.

THE COURT: I vaguely recall that.

MR. HAEFELE: Well, it turns out he must have a little bit more of a position than a kindly volunteer helping out on his own, because he is the one that was -- gave the power of attorney that allowed them to sell the property here in the U.S. and pretty much he is the one that the Sanabel Al Kheer people here in the U.S. were reporting to at the IIRO. So that's some indicator of how IIRO and Muslim World League were pulling the strings.

THE COURT: Let me hear from Mr. Manning a bit, and SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

DATCTERC

then I will get back to you. One of the problems I have with your side of the equation, Mr. Manning, is what we were just talking about. Even if I assumed that this is the equivalent of some benign entity, a stamp club that existed in one format, Dr. Nirza was a member of a club and an officer. He resigned from the first entity and when the second one started up, he was an officer of that. The position is that the two were unrelated. The stamp club, nonetheless, had engaged in transactions for which it didn't, evidently, retain paperwork long after litigation was contemplated, and the flow of funds clearly was an issue.

So why isn't the mere fact that things one would expect to be held either by the successor stamp club, or here Sanabel Al Kheer, related to the real estate transaction, documents that should have either been preserved by Sanabel Al Kheer, the U.S. entity, or its counsel as its agent. And why shouldn't I be troubled that documents like that are not available.

MR. MANNING: Your Honor, I think, first of all, it's important to clarify what these entities are. There's Sanabel Al Kheer, K-h-e-e-r, which is a Virginia corporation.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. MANNING: There is a Sana-Bell, D.C, which is a D.C. corporation. That's the entity that is now defunct. THE COURT: That's the one that's B-e-1-1?

DATCTERC

MR. MANNING: S-a-n-a, hyphen, B-e-l-l. Then there is this other entity that I don't represent and that was alluded to as being a sally company. So the two companies that we're talking about here, as far as the relationship, is Sana-Bell, D.C., I'll call it, and Sanabel of Virginia -- Sanabel Al Kheer, Virginia.

THE COURT: I agree. That's why I was saying to counsel that I think that the record as to the Saudi entity and the supposed parents or folks pulling the strings on behalf of the Saudi entity, I don't think there is a record in relation to this motion.

MR. MANNING: So, you know, I think what we have is, for a very brief timeline, as you mentioned, Dr. Nirza was -- did have a relationship with Sana-Bell of D.C. Then he had a relationship also with Sanabel Al Kheer, Virginia. In 2004 -- THE COURT: Does he continue to be affiliated with the Virginia entity?

MR. MANNING: With neither entity. In 2004, the current president of Sanabel of Virginia, and their two people on the board currently, the current president was essentially given a box of documents that related to Sanabel Al Kheer. We produced all of that documentation to include, as was mentioned, some documents as related to the transaction. Whatever documents that related to Sana-Bell, D.C. have, likewise, been produced. And then in a series of, I think it's

DATCTERC

1 2

 now four supplements to that production, we have produced bank records up to 2011.

THE COURT: Well, one troublesome thing, and I apologize for jumping around is that a large part of the production occurred on July 17th of this year, two days before your response was due as to this motion.

MR. MANNING: Right, your Honor. There is one thing that I personally have to apologize for. To get — to step back just for a moment, there were, starting in 2011, settlement conversations that began. And part of the delay in those settlement negotiations was that my client, not being as completely conversant in American law as others, didn't completely understand what a settlement fully meant. And so the reason for that delay was from my client asking for some sort of an averment that if this documentation that they were requesting was produced, that he would, in fact, be released. Because we weren't able to get that assurance, the settlement negotiations broke down — and I'm getting to your timing issue.

They broke down early 2013, I believe, or late 2012. And my personal apology is, as I referenced in the briefs, during early 2013, I was dealing with a personal family issue that resolved itself in early June. It's not an excuse. I did certainly create a delay in the production, but once we received this motion, I, as quickly as possible, turned that SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

DATCTERC

around. So that's the reason for the lack of timeliness of the most recent production, or the most recent supplementation.

THE COURT: Let's take, as an example, the real estate transaction. Was Sanabel Al Kheer, the Virginia entity, a party to that transaction?

MR. MANNING: It was.

THE COURT: So shouldn't there be a fuller record than the documents that you turned over, such as a complete closing binder?

MR. MANNING: Again, your Honor, what's been produced is what my client is in possession, custody and control of. There hasn't been any spoliation --

THE COURT: Possession and custody, perhaps, but I assume there was some real estate lawyer in the loop representing Sanabel Al Kheer. Did anybody reach out to that lawyer and say, We need your documents?

MR. MANNING: I'm trying to figure out the extent to which I can discuss my conversations with my client. But there were -- there was outreach to that -- to the lawyer that had handled the transaction. And if you would like, we can certainly make that outreach again, but I think everyone knows the result of the transaction --

THE COURT: I think your client has the obligation to produce that which is in his control, and that which is held by agents is clearly within his control. I presume the lawyers SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

DATCTERC

were paid their fees and, therefore, have no lien as part of the real estate transaction, and I can't imagine why every record that's responsive to the plaintiffs' requests is held by counsel that represented the Virginia corporation in relation to the closing hasn't already been produced.

MR. MANNING: Your Honor, we can --

THE COURT: There's also the issue of a producing party's obligation to reach out to former employees. And in one of his letters, Mr. Haefele -- I guess it's probably his reply -- cites a series of cases -- Footnote 4 on Page 2 of the reply letter brief says that there is no indication that Sanabel Al Kheer has taken any steps over the last several years to secure missing corporate records from Sana-Bell officers and employees, something it was obligated to do; citing a series of cases that suggest that that obligation exists, including at least one in the Southern District of New York.

I haven't actually read those cases, but it makes sense to me that there was at least an obligation to reach out and have the sense that that didn't occur here either.

MR. MANNING: Well, your Honor, I wasn't a party to the litigation. At that point, Mr. McMahon was and he also represented the company from a corporate context. So I think that when it gets back -- to kind of step back, I think your Honor is right. We might be premature to some degree, because SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

DATCTERC

 we have factual issues that we're essentially trying to try in the context of this motion for sanctions. But also, to your point, I think that there could be, perhaps, the involvement of my predecessor to clarify a few of those issues, although it's certainly my obligation to know all of that, but he -- it's sometimes difficult to engage that person.

THE COURT: One of the points that you make is that Sanabel entities, if you give me a second.

Off the record.

(Off the record)

THE COURT: It's not jumping out at me, but I thought within your letter you made the point that the Court had never, perhaps, previously directed or warned Sanabel that -- here, it is here.

Cited on Page 3 to American Cash Card saying, "One of the factors to be considered is (d) whether the noncompliant party has been warned about the possibility of sanctions. And specifically with respect to Sanabel Al Kheer, although there's been a lot of backing and forthing between them among counsel, I don't know that I have ever specifically done that.

So what I'm inclined to do at the interim measure is to make such a directive and say that Sanabel Al Kheer, the Virginia entity, has to boil the ocean and produce any additional documents that it has within four weeks and then revisit this question.

DATCTERC 20

I know I'm kicking the can down a little, Mr. Haefele, but any reaction to that?

MR. HAEFELE: Pardon me, your Honor?

 THE COURT: I said I know I'm kicking the can down the road a bit, but any reaction to that?

MR. HAEFELE: I do have a reaction to a number of items. First off, the one thing I wanted to address quickly is that, as I think it was in our motion papers -- if not the original one, but the reply letter -- there were never any settlement discussions. I know repeatedly Mr. Manning has articulated a dialogue of settlement discussions, but I think you made the point that there has never been any settlement discussions.

THE COURT: Whether there were or weren't -- let me assume for the sake of argument that there were -- is utterly irrelevant in terms of the duty to produce documents.

MR. HAEFELE: I agree, your Honor. I agree.

THE COURT: I think that's really not terribly informative with respect to the motion that's before me. On the other hand, when Mr. Manning tells me that there were personal issues that delayed the last production, that's something I am certain of.

MR. HAEFELE: As were we, your Honor. I'm not sure --we had some dialogue on it, I'm not sure when his personal issues started. I'm aware of what they are and I think we've SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

21 DATCTERC been happy, I suppose -- I don't know if that's the right word 1 2 -- to provide him with extensions that were needed to address the motion. So absolutely, your Honor, we agree with you on 3 that. But I think we have been chasing basic discovery since 4 5 2007, and certainly I know for a fact that the issues don't go 6 back that far. 7 Going back to one of the things we said earlier --8 THE COURT: Nor does his representation of this 9 client. 10 MR. HAEFELE: I know that his representation also 11 significantly precedes the issues --THE COURT: Fair enough. 12 MR. HAEFELE: I will gladly defer, let him tell you 13 14 more if that's the case. 15 Going back to one of the issues that you raised 16 earlier, your Honor, it has been called to my attention that 17 Sana-Bell existed, at least, as of September 9, 2002, because it was on that day that Sana-Bell -- I'm sorry. September 9, 18 2002, certificate from the government of the District of 19 20 Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs 21 certified that on that day Sana-Bell's articles of incorporation were revoked. So I think that calls, at least 22 clarifies, that as of at least that day Sana-Bell existed, the 23 first Sana-Bell existed. 24 25 And in addition, in this litigation, Sana-Bell filed

DATCTERC motions, made appearances, twice hired lawyers, and it was only 1 2 to the extent -- I mean, they represented that they existed through their counsel in motions and in appearances at least 3 until it was to their benefit to begin arguing that they didn't 4 5 exist. THE COURT: But so did Rabita trust. When you sit 6 down with my decision, you will see I concluded really 7 Mr. McMahon was not in a position to represent Rabita trust. 8 MR. HAEFELE: Right. I understand. 9 THE COURT: It may be the same circumstance here that 10 he abrogated onto himself the ability to represent the D.C. 11 corporation, because somebody on behalf of the Virginia 12 corporation decided to retain him. 13 MR. HAEFELE: Going to Mr. McMahon for a moment, you 14 may recall, your Honor, that at the time, Mr. Manning came on 15 board, I think shortly after or right around the time period, 16 17 Mr. McMahon filed a motion to withdraw as counsel as well. 18 THE COURT: When was that? MR. HAEFELE: I don't actually recall --19 20 THE COURT: Mr. Manning. MR. MANNING: I don't remember the exact date. 2010. 21 THE COURT: Approximately. 22 MR. MANNING: 2010. MR. HAEFELE: And right around that time, when 23 24 Mr. McMahon filed his motion to withdraw as counsel, plaintiffs 25 SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

DATCTERC

actually opposed that, because there was some issues that we felt Mr. McMahon needed to continue to be at least in the litigation related to Sana-Bell, because he had involvement with certain facts.

Well, one of the things that he had involvement in was the 2008 closing. I believe -- I'm not certain -- but I believe he was the lawyer that did the closing. If he wasn't, he was at least involved in it, and we believe that he would have all of the records from that 2008 closing. We find it very odd if he was involved with the closing, why those documents were not available to be produced to the plaintiffs.

THE COURT: You have refreshed my recollection that there is something in your letter that suggests that his firm at least was involved. And if that's correct, it boggles the mind that you don't have those records. And certainly Mr. Manning, that's one of the things you need to look at.

MR. HAEFELE: I think one of the issues --

THE COURT: In the 30-day window.

MR. MANNING: To clarify, your Honor, I mean, we have requested from Mr. McMahon all documents relating to both entities, to the extent they existed. So we will be following up with him as well.

MR. HAEFELE: Other than the 2008 closing documents, there are a host of other things that we have requested that are basic discovery things -- things that are particular that SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

2.4

DATCTERC

1

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ought to exist -- and we don't have any of them. And I know -- the problem that comes is that Mr. McMahon and Mr. Manning have repeated a number of times, Sorry folks, that's all there is. And then, you know, later on, when we start honing in on what it really is, or what ought to exist, suddenly we get a dribble drabble.

THE COURT: I'm not sure you made the record even to Sanabel Al Kheer. I mean, the closing binder is a no-brainer. Someplace that should exist. But let's take minutes of meetings of the Virginia entity from its formation until now, I agree with you, those should exist and if you haven't gotten them, I'm not saying that's a potential problem, but saying they should exist is different than saying they ever did exist. If there were no minutes of meetings, then you can't produce that which didn't exist. It seems to me that what I said earlier that the motion may be premature. What may be missing, in part, is a deposition of a 30(b(6) witness who says, Yes, we did take minutes; we took minutes after 9/11; after the suit was filed; and we don't have them now. Then you would have a failure to preserve, or spoliation, and a much stronger motion; but the mere fact that it's logical that there should be minutes is not the same as saying there were minutes, and now they no longer exist.

MR. HAEFELE: I understand your point, your Honor. I think that overriding point, though, is that from the time of SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

DATCTERC

1.1

discovery -- from the time discovery started in 2007, we have been fighting tooth and nail to get any document. We have been chasing them from 2007 until 2013 to get anything that we have gotten, and it's only when we continually hound them that we get anything. And I will be honest, I haven't had the opportunity to read your decision from last night, but it's pretty clear that that is not particular, unfortunately, to the Sanabel defendants. It's, unfortunately, from most of the defendants or all of the defendants in this litigation, where there is this unfortunate notion that they aren't obligated to produce discovery unless plaintiffs' hound them and then come to the Court to ask the Court for assistance. And during that process they let out a few documents to make the argument that, Oh, we are making our efforts.

The fact is there is -- plaintiffs' view is there is an orchestrated process in the defendants' part to delay, obfuscate and drain the plaintiffs of their resources until the clock runs out on the litigation, and that is something that needs to be stopped.

THE COURT: Assuming your assumption is correct, I don't disagree with you certainly, I think the ground rules and the ability to find excuses will decline as some of the earlier decisions related to this move forward, but I think for the time being what I'm going to do is reserve decision as to the Sana-Bell motion. I direct that Mr. Manning go back to the SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

DATCTERC

well to produce the documents that should have been produced, to the extent they exist, within four weeks, but I also think there's a burden on the plaintiffs to show that, not that the documents should have existed, but that the documents did, in fact, exist. So I think really what plaintiffs need to do is take a 30(b)(6) deposition and connect those dots, and I probably will award sanctions, or recommend a default judgment, or whatever the appropriate remedy is.

MR. HAEFELE: Your Honor, in regard to what they are obligated to produce, we would like for it to be the universe of documents for Sanabel Al Kheer, and any entity that they have the ability, the practical ability, to get documents from; and we believe that that would include their Saudi alter ego, the Sanabel Al Khair entity. They are essentially -- again, like we said earlier, the strings get pulled from Saudi Arabia.

THE COURT: Well, I think I said that in relation to this case -- if not, I have certainly said it in relation to other cases -- if there's either the practical ability, as a matter of business, routine to get documents from a parent company, or if there is an adequate showing that they are alter egos -- I guess as to Al Khair, that's what I was thinking of -- I made that finding, then I don't disagree with you. If documents are available from the parent entity on either of those two bases, they would have to be produced.

MR. LEWIS: Your Honor, we were not -- I represent SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

DATCTERC

IIRO and the Muslim World League. I am also part of the post-McMahon era, so I don't go back and have all of the factual background. But there have been --

THE COURT: Just so I understand, did Mr. McMahon, in the era before your arrival, represent MWL and IIRO by himself?

MR. LEWIS: He did, your Honor, and there have just been a number of statements made that pertain to my client, and unless silence implies assent, I just want to make clear on the record we do not accept that IIRO or MWL are pulling any strings for anybody. Sanabel is a separate entity. There may

have been a debt, but again, I don't want to make a representation on the record money that they may have been owed, but we don't accept that one was controlling the other.

There was also a comment made about chasing after documents. Your Honor, I think they will find that they will have finally caught the bus. We have a team that your Honor will have seen in our report of September 20th, that's going around the world to these offices, and are reviewing documents; there are Arabic speakers. So there are documents that have been produced in a large volume that are in the process of being produced.

And finally with respect to Mr. Al Rhadi, there was a suggestion made that somehow he is not the kindly older gentleman that he seems, or not a volunteer. It is not unusual in Saudi charities for there to be many volunteers. Nor is SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

DATCTERC

there any reason to suspect that Mr. Rhadi is other than as he represents, a concerned person who works at the charity as a volunteer and does a great deal of work and continues to do a great deal of work to help with our compliance. So I just wanted to let your Honor know that the suggestion that Mr. Al Rhadi is playing some nefarious identity game just has no basis. Thank you.

THE COURT: And I preceded my last remark by saying if there is a showing of impracticality or that MWL and/or IIRO are alter egos of Sanabel Al Kheer, the U.S. entity, then consequences would flow from that, but the first word in the sentence was "if." And to date, there hasn't been such a showing, at least in relation to this motion.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ LEWIS: Nor has it even been alleged in the motion, at least as I...

THE COURT: I think it is sort of alluded to in the motion or the reply, but certainly there's discussion of MWL and IIRO, probably in relation to the real estate closing.

MR. HAEFELE: Your Honor, very quickly. First off, I meant -- I have no knowledge of whether or not Mr. Rhadi is either kindly or elderly. It certainly seems as though he has authority with relation to IIRO, and Muslim World League, and also with regard to the Sanabel entities. And if that becomes something, your Honor, we would be happy to brief that further and provide the additional information for your Honor with SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

DATCTERC

regard to the relationship.

And with regard to the "pulling the strings" issue, I call your Honor's attention to the fact that the original Sana-Bell board -- I'm not sure about the later board of the new Sanabel -- but the original board consisted of six Muslim World League and IIRO representatives, officers on the board, so I think there is some indication that at least at that point, at the inception -- and there seems to be no indication that that ever changed, given the kind of interactions that happened with regard to things that were in the briefing.

MR. LEWIS: Your Honor, if that motion is ever tee'd up, we're happy to respond. I live in the District, around the District of Columbia. I suspect if 2002 they got around to revoking the articles for nonpayment, I suspect Sana-Bell was not doing its corporate work for some years, but -- well before that. Again, that's premature and we can address that in due course. Thank you.

MR. MANNING: Exactly, your Honor. My understanding of the cause of that document being sent was very likely that the entity didn't, in fact, exist. So, in fact, if anything, it might be evidence that it wasn't there.

THE COURT: Well, it hadn't paid whatever fees were required, I would assume.

MR. MANNING: Understood.

And just to clarify, I'm certainly interested in SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

DATCTERC

 working with the plaintiffs to, as you said, boil the ocean, but I want to clarify that the showing that you just alluded to as to strings being pulled from Sanabel, Saudi Arabia, et cetera, has not been made at this point. So as a result, the universe of what we need to be boiling the ocean for is that which relates to Sana-Bell, D.C. and Sanabel Al Kheer, Virginia.

THE COURT: I'm not sure I wholly agree with that. At some point down the road, I may have to make a determination as to whether, either MWL or IIRO -- let me rephrase it.

I may have to make a determination down the road as to whether Sanabel, the Virginia entity, had either the practical ability to obtain documents from the Saudi Arabian entity; or the two were so intricately intertwined, that they are one in the same. If I make that determination down the road, and if prior to that determination, the Virginia entity had not obtained documents responsive to the plaintiffs' requests that it could have obtained or should have obtained, consequences will flow from that.

So I think that's a determination that you and your client need to make. If you believe that neither of those is correct, then presumably you won't produce and wouldn't be able to produce documents held by the Saudi Arabian entity.

On the other hand, if, in your discussions with your client, you can prove either of those is correct, I think you SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

DATCTERC

do have the obligation to produce documents from Saudi Arabia.

MR. MANNING: Understood.

MR. HAEFELE: Your Honor, only one last thing.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. HAEFELE: I hope.

The only concern that we have, I think, your Honor, one of the major concerns we have really is the timeline in the litigation. If we keep a proposed endline for ending discovery and we keep drawing out when we're going to get things from the defendants, we're putting our back to the wall -- we are putting plaintiffs' back to the wall in terms of how we proceed -- and we have been doing this since 2007, or actually in the litigation earlier than that. I just wanted to make sure we put that on the record, and call your Honor's attention to that. You know, none of us wants this to go on forever. We want a time period where we can actually get to a trial, or some kind of resolution.

Our purpose here, our request here was for dispositive sanctions, because, quite frankly, if they are saying they are not going to give us any more, and, you know, we don't want to waste the time chasing our tails to get nothing.

THE COURT: I'm mindful of that, but I don't think there is an adequate record at the moment. Certainly, let me take the default judgment that you asked for. I don't think there is an adequate record to grab a default judgment SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

DATCTERC

 certainly with respect to the Virginia entity.

So if I were to decide the motion today, I would probably deny that. So I think I'm benefiting the plaintiffs by reserving decision and proceeding down the road. I am, even though it subtracts from it somewhat. I understand in terms of the big picture, that -- believe me. I share your desire to see, you know, the end of this litigation. Whether I will in my lifetime remains to be seen, but as an aspirational goal, I certainly share that.

MR. HAEFELE: I just don't want your Honor surprised when somewhere down the road, we say, We still need more time to get more from the defendants.

THE COURT: I will not be flabbergasted to hear that. We also should set up a time for the next conference.

MR. CARTER: Your Honor, there is one thing and I will raise it with the defendants separately. There are sort of two orders floating around concerning briefing. There was a briefing system that was in place set by your Honor's order back in 2011, January of 2011, which is -- if I can read the ECF document 2401 --

THE COURT: What did I say then?

MR. CARTER: -- which is the old procedure where you file a letter brief three weeks in advance of the hearing, and the response would come in two weeks, and the reply five days, everything will be delivered at that time to your Honor in a SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

33 DATCTERC 1 package. 2 And then in 2013 your Honor issued a briefing schedule 3 for motions to compel. Document 2649, which essentially 4 provides a three-week response period, and then a one-week 5 period for replies. 6 The two schedules are not harmonious, and in certain 7 cases we have had instances where motions are raised as being 8 motions other than motions to compel, and there is some 9 confusion. So I think we're going to request that we be under 10 a single briefing motion. 11 THE COURT: That certainly makes sense. And why don't 12 you confer with the other side and tell me what schedule will 13 makes sense. As long as it gives me sufficient time before any 14 of our conferences, it's fine with me. MR. CARTER: Thank you, your Honor. 15 16 THE COURT: When should we set our next conference 17 for? We are coming up against the holidays. I've got two back-to-back trials in early December. Is December 13th too 18 19 soon? 20 MR. CARTER: No, your Honor. THE COURT: That's a Friday. Could we say, then, 10 21 22 o'clock on Friday the 13th? 23 MR. MANNING: Your Honor, is it possible to do 11:00? 24 THE COURT: That day it's absolutely possible. Thank 25 you all.